

DTIC FILE COPY

1

ARI Research Note 90-85

AD-A226 716

The Sociology of the Army Noncommissioned Officer: A Preliminary Assessment

Charles C. Moskos

Northwestern University

for

**Contracting Officer's Representative
Michael Drillings**

DTIC
ELECTE
SEP 26 1990
S D CS D

**Basic Research
Michael Kaplan, Director**

July 1990



**United States Army
Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences**

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

3

U.S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

A Field Operating Agency Under the Jurisdiction
of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel

EDGAR M. JOHNSON
Technical Director

JON W. BLADES
COL, IN
Commanding

Research accomplished under contract for
the Department of the Army

Northwestern University

Technical review by

Michael Drillings

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By _____	
Distribution /	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	

DTIC
COPY
INSPECTED
1

NOTICES

DISTRIBUTION: This report has been cleared for release to the Defense Technical Information Center (DTIC) to comply with regulatory requirements. It has been given no primary distribution other than to DTIC and will be available only through DTIC or the National Technical Information Service (NTIS).

FINAL DISPOSITION: This report may be destroyed when it is no longer needed. Please do not return it to the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

NOTE: The views, opinions, and findings in this report are those of the author(s) and should not be construed as an official Department of the Army position, policy, or decision, unless so designated by other authorized documents.

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

1a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified			1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS --		
2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY --			3. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF REPORT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.		
2b. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE --			5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) ARI Research Note 90-85		
4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) --			7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION U.S. Army Research Institute		
6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION Department of Sociology Northwestern University		6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (if applicable) --		7b. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) 5001 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22333-5600	
6c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Evanston, IL 60208			9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER MDA903-89-C-0039		
8a. NAME OF FUNDING/SPONSORING ORGANIZATION U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences		8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (if applicable) PERI-BR		10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS	
8c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) 5001 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22333-5600		PROGRAM ELEMENT NO. 61102B		PROJECT NO. 74F	TASK NO. N/A
				WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO. N/A	
11. TITLE (Include Security Classification) The Sociology of the Army Noncommissioned Officer: A Preliminary Assessment					
12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Moskos, Charles					
13a. TYPE OF REPORT Interim		13b. TIME COVERED FROM 82/09 TO 86/09		14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 1990, July	
15. PAGE COUNT 38					
16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION Contracting Officer's Representative, Michael Drillings					
17. COSATI CODES			18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)		
FIELD	GROUP	SUB-GROUP	Military sociology, Army noncommissioned officer.		
19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) The working assumption of this paper is that noncommissioned officers (NCOs), theoretically as well as substantively, are worthy of study separate from professional soldiers and enlisted men. This report contains mainly tabular data. An examination of the available statistical data highlights significant social and demographic trends in the NCO corps. Major findings include changes in the percentages of enlisted members, black NCOs, and female NCOs, time to promotion to NCO status, and data concerning marriage and children.					
20. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED <input type="checkbox"/> SAME AS RPT. <input type="checkbox"/> DTIC USERS			21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified		
22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL Michael Drillings			22b. TELEPHONE (Include Area Code) (202) 274-8722		22c. OFFICE SYMBOL PERI-BR

THE SOCIOLOGY OF THE ARMY NONCOMMISSIONED OFFICER: A PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Remarkably, the noncommissioned officer (NCO) of the U.S. Army has never been an object of systematic and focused attention in the sociology of the military. One reason for the lack of basic research is that NCOs are a distinctive social type not readily subsumed under the conventional paradigms of "professional soldier" or "enlisted culture" that dominate the social science literature of the armed forces. The working assumption is that NCOs, theoretically as well as substantively, are worthy of study in their own right.

This report consists mainly of tabular data. An examination of the available statistical data highlights significant social and demographic trends pertaining to the NCO corps. We can summarize the major findings as follows:

1. There has been an absolute and proportional decline in the junior enlisted force. This trend has occurred not only from the draft era to the volunteer Army, but also during the volunteer Army period. The reduction in force that has characterized the volunteer Army has occurred almost entirely in the private ranks.
2. The proportion of the enlisted force with between 11 and 19 years of service has increased markedly. The proportion of enlisted members with over 20 years of service, however, has declined.
3. Promotion to NCO status occurs more quickly in the Army than in any other service.
4. The proportion of black NCOs is much higher in the Army than in any other service and is higher than the proportion of blacks among junior enlisted members.
5. The proportion of blacks among Army female personnel exceeds that among male personnel, especially at the NCO level.
6. Female NCOs, compared to their male counterparts, are (a) less likely to be married, (b) if married, much more likely to have a military spouse, and (c) whether married to a civilian or military spouse, much less likely to have children.
7. Survey data suggest that value congruence is more likely to be found between first-term soldiers and junior NCOs than between junior NCOs and senior NCOs.

This report is the first in a three-part research project to present a sociology of the Army NCO. The research findings will be of value to policy makers and planners dealing with the impending "downsizing" of the U.S. Army.

THE SOCIOLOGY OF THE ARMY NONCOMMISSIONED OFFICER: A PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT

CONTENTS

	Page
THE SOCIOLOGY OF THE ARMY NONCOMMISSIONED OFFICER.	1
PERSONNEL FORCE STRUCTURE: TABLES A-1 TO A-5.	9
YEARS IN SERVICE: TABLES B-1 TO B-3	14
ENLISTED ENTRANTS: TABLES C-1 TO C-6.	17
RACE AND GENDER COMPOSITION; TABLES D-1 TO D-8.	23
MARITAL AND FAMILY STATUS: TABLES E-1 TO E-11	31
COMPARISONS OF CIVILIAN AND ARMY LIFE: TABLE F-1.	42
AVERAGE AFQT OF ENLISTED MEMBERS BY GRADE: TABLE G-1.	43

THE SOCIOLOGY OF THE ARMY NONCOMMISSIONED OFFICER:

A PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT

"Sergants are the backbone of the Army." How often one has heard that commonplace assertion. Indeed, the Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army designated 1989 as the "Year of the NCO." Yet, the remarkable fact exists that the Non-Commissioned Officer (NCO) of the U.S. Army has never been an object of systematic and focused attention in the sociology of the military.

One reason for the lack of basic research on the Army NCO is that sergeants are a distinctive social type not readily subsumed under the conventional paradigms of "professional soldier" or "enlisted culture" that dominate the social science literature of the armed forces. The working assumption of this research project is that NCOs, theoretically as well as substantively, are worthy of study in their own right.

Research on the NCO is required, however, not only for its conceptual importance, but also because NCOs bear critically on virtually every aspect of military social organization -- cohesion in combat groups, unit training and performance, leadership, personnel retention, career development, the military family, race relations, sex roles, to name a few. Indeed, there is practically no area of military life that does not relate to the role of the NCO. The absence of basic research on this topic is thus all the more noteworthy.

This report is the first in a three-part research project. This report consists of tabular data based on available manpower statistics. Our focus is on social and demographic trends among NCOs. The data deals with

similarities and differences along three core dimensions: between Army NCOs and NCOs in other services; between NCOs and officers and junior enlisted members, and by social categories within Army NCOs. These tabular data have appeared nowhere else in the format given here. For purposes of clarity, numbers in the text discussion are rounded off to the nearest whole percent. The reader is advised to examine the tables independently for a more detailed picture of social and demographic trends among American military personnel.

The data base given here in turn will be used as a foundation for subsequent reports in this project. The second report will present findings based upon participant observations and in-depth interviews with NCOs. The third report will highlight organizational features in the American NCO system by making cross-national comparisons with NCO corps in other Western nations. The final technical report will be based on the three earlier reports and specify the implications of the sociology of the Army NCO for basic research and policy.

TABULAR DATA

Personnel Force Structure: Tables A-1 to A-5. Trend data is presented for selected years: 1963/4 (pre-Vietnam draft), 1969 (Vietnam peak), 1978/80 (early AVF), and 1989 (current AVF). For both the DOD and the Army, the long-term trend is toward an increasing proportion of officers, senior NCOs (E7-E9), and junior NCOs (E5-E6), and a corresponding decline in junior enlisted members (E1-E4). Within the Army the decline has been particularly pronounced for the private ranks (E1-E3): from 48 percent in 1963, 37 percent in 1980, 30 percent in 1989. For senior NCOs, the pattern was in a growing proportion of enlisted personnel: 6 percent in 1963, 9 percent in 1980, and 11 percent in 1989.

That proportionate and actual decline of the junior enlisted force continued during the AVF period is noteworthy. In actual numbers, the findings are most striking. From 1964 to 1989 the total Army enlisted ranks declined by 190,000, a number less than the decline in the private ranks (E1-E3) -- 208,000. In effect, the downsizing of the Army from the draft era to the current AVF period occurred almost entirely at the private ranks.

Years in Service: Tables B-1 to B-3. The "grade creep" noted above is paralleled by the increasing longevity of the enlisted force during the AVF era. Whereas 63 percent of the Army enlisted force had less than four years of service in 1978, the corresponding figure in 1989 was 51 percent. The proportion with between 11 and 19 years of service increased markedly: from 12 percent in 1978 to 20 percent in 1989. The proportion of enlisted members with over twenty years of service, however, declined over the same period,

from 4 to 2 percent.

Compared to other services, the Army has the shortest average promotion times, especially at the junior NCO level. Thus the rank of E5 is typically achieved at 6.9 years in the Army, compared with 8.3 years in Navy, 8.7 years in the Marine Corps, and 10.8 years in the Air Force. The promotion rate in the Army thus compares favorably with both the more technical Air Force and Navy as well as the less technical Marine Corps.

Enlisted Entrants: Tables C-1 to C-6. Future NCOs reflect current enlisted entrants. High quality recruits are defined by the military as individuals possessing high school diplomas who score in the top half of the mental test distribution (Categories I-III A). The quality of Army recruits has improved dramatically over the course of the AVF. For male entrants, the number meeting the above criteria was 17 percent in 1980, 48 percent in 1983, 52 percent in 1986, and 54 percent in 1989. These percentages, however, are based on decreasing numbers of actual entrants. Thus, the number of high quality Army recruits was some 55,000 in 1983 and 49,000 in 1989. Also noteworthy is that in the 1980s, for the first time, the percentage of high quality recruits in the Army exceeded that of the Navy.

Longitudinal data on mental test scores shows a marked improvement over the course of the AVF, though there has been some softening from 1987 to 1989. The percentage of Category I's in the AVF Army, however, has not matched that of the draft era (though the percentage of Category I's and II's combined has). More striking is the decline in the actual numbers of Army entrants in Category I between the pre-Vietnam draft and current AVF eras: 15,325 in 1960, 12,474 in 1964, and 3,358 in 1989.

Army male entrants with high school diplomas increased markedly from 1980 to 1989, from 52 to 87 percent. Black entrants have consistently had higher educational levels than white entrants. Female entrants of all races consistently have had higher educational and mental group levels than their male counterparts.

Race and Gender Composition: Tables D-1 to D-8. The Army has a greater black representation at all grades for both officers and enlisted members than any other service. In 1989, blacks made up 11 percent of Army officers, 32 percent of sergeant majors, 37 percent of staff sergeants, and 27 percent of privates.

Females make up 11 percent of Army personnel compared with 13 percent in the Air Force, 10 percent in the Navy, and 4 percent in the Marine Corps. In 1989, females made up 11 percent of Army officers, 1 percent of sergeant majors, 9 percent of staff sergeants, and 11 percent of privates. The number of female NCOs at the junior NCO level (E5) increased from 8 percent in 1978 to 11 percent in 1984 to 12 percent in 1989.

Noteworthy is that the proportion of blacks among Army female personnel exceeds that among male personnel. In 1989, blacks accounted for 47 percent of all female enlisted members (versus 31 percent of males); 54 percent of E5s (versus 36 percent), 42 percent of E7s (versus 29 percent).

Marital and Family Status: Table E-1 to E-11. Marked differences characterize the marital and family status of male and female NCOs. For senior Army NCOs (E6-E9), 5 percent of males are married with no children compared with 21 percent of females in the same category. For senior NCOs, 5 percent of males are married to a military spouse compared with 36 percent of

females. Among senior NCOs who are married, 73 percent of males have children compared with 42 percent of female NCOs.

The overall pattern is that career military women -- whether enlisted or officer -- compared to their male counterparts -- are: (1) less likely to be married, (2) if married, much more likely to be married to a military spouse, and (3) whether married to a civilian or military spouse, much less likely to have children. Similar patterns obtain in all services.

Comparisons of Civilian and Army Life: Table F-1. A large sample of Army veterans characterized the relative likelihood of selected values (e.g. promotion, credit for good work, making friends). No significant differences were found between first-term separatees (typically 3-4 years of service) and mid-term separatees (typically 6-12 years). Large differences were found between these two groups and retirees (typically 20 years of service) who were much more likely to evaluate the Army in positive terms. The data suggest the provocative hypothesis that value congruence is more likely to be found between first-term soldiers and junior NCOs than between junior NCOs and senior NCOs.

Average AFQT Percentile of Enlisted Members by Grade: Table G-1. Army NCOs are more likely to score lower on the Armed Forces Qualification Test (AFQT) than NCOs of other services. In contrast, to other services, Army junior NCOs (E5-E6) are likely to have lower AFQT scores than junior enlisted personnel.

SUMMARY

The working assumption is that sociology of the Army NCO is worthy of study in its own right, both theoretically and substantively. An examination of statistical data highlights significant social and demographic trends pertaining to the NCO corps. We can summarize the major findings as follows:

(1) There has been an absolute and proportional decline in the junior enlisted force. This trend has occurred not only from the draft era to the volunteer Army, but also during the volunteer Army period. The reduction in force that has characterized the volunteer Army has occurred almost entirely at the private ranks.

(2) The proportion of the enlisted force with between 11 and 19 years of service has increased markedly. The proportion of enlisted members with over 20 years of service, however, has declined.

(3) Promotion to NCO status occurs more quickly in the Army than in any other service.

(4) The proportion of black NCOs is much higher in the Army than in any other service and is higher than the proportion of blacks among junior enlisted members.

(5) The proportion of blacks among Army female personnel exceeds that among male personnel, especially at the NCO level.

(6) Female NCOs, compared to their male counterparts, are: (a) less likely to be married; (b) if married, much more likely to have a military spouse; and (c) whether married to a civilian or military spouse, much less likely to have children.

(7) Survey data suggest that value congruence is more likely to be found between first-term soldier and junior NCOs than between junior NCOs and senior NCOs.

The purpose of basic research is not so much to provide concrete policy prescriptions, but to create data bases, furnish information, and inform ways of thinking that can be used to evaluate present and proposed military manpower policies. Most important, this report presents research findings that will be of value to policy makers and planners dealing with the impending "downsizing" of the U.S. Army.

Table A-1. DOD PERSONNEL STRUCTURE BY SELECTED YEARS (percentages)

Grade Groups	1963	1969	1978	1989
Officer	12.5	12.3	13.3	13.4
Senior NCOs (E9 - E7)	6.0	6.2	8.0	8.9
Junior NCOs (E6 - E5)	23.3	23.5	19.6	28.7
Junior Enlisted (E4 - E1)	58.2	58.0	59.1	49.0
Total (N in '000)	100.0 (2,679)	100.0 (3,395)	100.0 (2,049)	100.0 (2,151)

Source: Department of Defense statistics

Table A-2. ARMY PERSONNEL STRUCTURE BY SELECTED YEARS (percentages)

Grade Groups	1963	1969	1978	1989
Officer	11.4	12.5	12.6	14.0
Senior NCOs (E9 - E7)	5.6	5.8	8.0	9.2
Junior NCOs (E6 - E5)	23.8	23.5	24.4	27.4
Junior Enlisted (E4 - E1)	59.2	58.2	55.2	49.4
Total (N in '000)	100.0 (957)	100.0 (1,459)	100.0 (767)	100.0 (765)

Source: Department of Defense statistics

Table A-3. ENLISTED FORCE STRUCTURE BY SERVICE: 1989 (percentages)

Grade	Army	Navy	Air Force	Marine Corps
E-9	.6	.9	1.0	1.0
E-8	2.2	2.0	2.0	2.1
E-7	7.8	6.6	8.4	5.3
E-6	13.7	16.1	12.4	8.5
E-5	18.2	20.2	24.1	14.9
E-4	28.0	20.9	28.3	19.6
E-3	13.9	13.3	14.6	30.7
E-2	7.9	10.3	5.7	11.6
E-1	7.7	9.7	3.5	6.3
Total (N in '000)	100.0 (658)	100.0 (514)	100.0 (463)	100.0 (197)

Source: Department of Defense statistics

Table A-4. ARMY ENLISTED FORCE STRUCTURE BY SELECTED YEARS (percentages)

Grade	1964	1980	1989
E-9	.3	.6	.6
E-8	1.3	1.6	2.2
E-7	4.7	6.8	7.8
E-6	9.9	11.4	13.7
E-5	17.0	17.8	18.2
E-4	19.3	25.3	28.0
E-3	26.2	14.4	13.9
E-2	9.6	10.5	7.9
E-1	11.7	11.6	7.7
Total (N in '000)	100.0 (848)	100.0 (664)	100.0 (658)

Source: Department of Defense statistics

Table A-5. ARMY ENLISTED FORCE STRUCTURE BY SELECTED YEARS

Grade	1964	1980	1989
E-9	2,906	3,714	4,237
E-8	11,416	12,974	14,600
E-7	40,113	45,387	51,195
E-6	84,351	74,874	90,056
E-5	143,906	117,728	119,711
E-4	163,391	168,234	184,622
E-3	221,859	95,326	91,625
E-2	80,594	69,471	51,670
E-1	99,366	76,202	50,403
Total	847,922	663,910	658,119

Source: Department of Defense statistics

**Table B-1. YEARS IN SERVICE OF ARMY ENLISTED FORCE
BY SELECTED YEARS (percentages)**

Years in Service	1978	1980	1984	1989
1-4	63.1	60.6	54.2	51.4
5-10	21.3	23.0	27.7	25.8
11-19	11.9	12.3	14.6	20.4
20 & over	3.7	4.1	3.5	2.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Department of Defense statistics

**Table B-2. YEARS IN SERVICE AT TIME OF PROMOTION FOR
ENLISTED GRADES BY SERVICE, 1989**

Enlisted Grade	Army	Navy	Air Force	Marine Corps
E-9	21.6	20.5	21.9	22.0
E-8	17.0	17.0	19.0	17.3
E-7	12.1	12.4	15.4	12.2
E-6	7.6	8.0	11.7	8.1
E-5	4.2	4.3	6.0	4.9
E-4	1.8	2.0	2.9	2.7
E-3	.9	1.0	.9	1.1

Source: Department of Defense statistics

**Table B-3. YEARS IN SERVICE AT TIME OF PROMOTION FOR
OFFICER GRADES BY SERVICE, 1989**

Officer Grade	Army	Navy	Air Force	Marine Corps
O-10	31.7	32.6	30.9	34.8
O-9	30.2	30.3	29.3	33.6
O-8	26.8	28.7	26.5	30.2
O-7	25.2	27.0	24.8	27.2
O-6	19.5	19.3	19.2	21.5
O-5	15.7	14.0	15.6	16.3
O-4	10.2	8.7	10.5	10.7
O-3	3.1	3.3	3.6	4.8
O-2	1.3	1.9	1.9	2.2

Source: Department of Defense statistics

Table C-1. PERCENTAGE OF MALE ENTRANTS WITH HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA AND IN CATEGORY I-III A BY SERVICE AND SELECTED YEARS (non-prior service)

Year	Army	Navy	Air Force	Marine Corps
1977 (N in '000)	22.4 (147)	42.9 (92)	66.6 (55)	34.9 (41)
1980 (N in '000)	17.0 (135)	42.1 (75)	52.6 (57)	33.3 (38)
1983 (N in '000)	47.6 (115)	59.1 (63)	73.4 (49)	52.6 (34)
1986 (N in '000)	51.5 (112)	47.1 (75)	70.0 (52)	62.3 (32)
1989 (N in '000)	53.8 (91)	46.6 (76)	82.0 (33)	63.0 (30)

Source: Department of Defense statistics

**Table C-2. PERCENTAGE OF MALE ENTRANTS BY MENTAL GROUP
FOR SELECTED YEARS (non-prior service)**

Year	I	II	III	IV	Total (N)
1960	8.2	24.1	50.7	17.0	100.0 (186,893)
1964	5.7	28.0	46.4	19.9	100.0 (218,851)
1969	6.1	28.3	38.1	27.5	100.0 (441,250)
1975	4.5	30.3	55.1	10.0	100.0 (165,610)
1977	2.3	17.9	36.4	43.4	100.0 (153,434)
1979	1.7	14.4	35.1	48.7	100.0 (112,088)
1981	2.2	21.4	44.5	30.9	100.0 (98,578)
1983	3.5	33.0	51.5	12.0	100.0 (115,475)
1985	4.3	30.8	53.9	11.0	100.0 (103,327)
1987	4.3	34.5	56.6	4.6	100.0 (104,041)
1989	3.7	32.1	56.2	8.0	100.0 (90,783)

Source: Department of Defense statistics

Table C-3. PERCENTAGE OF ARMY MALE ENTRANTS WITH HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA BY RACE FOR SELECTED YEARS (non-prior service)

Year	White	Black	Other	Total
1977	52.4	64.6	55.2	56.2
1979	55.0	65.3	52.0	58.6
1980	44.7	60.4	39.8	48.9
1981	73.8	88.8	80.8	77.9
1985	87.5	95.4	91.8	87.0
1989	86.8	94.1	90.9	88.8

Source: Department of Defense statistics

Table C-4. PERCENTAGE OF ARMY FEMALE ENTRANTS WITH HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA BY RACE FOR SELECTED YEARS (non-prior service)

Year	White	Black	Other	Total
1977	88.9	93.3	90.6	89.6
1978	95.4	97.4	95.3	96.0
1980	83.0	92.3	87.3	86.9
1981	98.9	97.8	95.9	94.1
1985	99.9	100.0	100.0	99.9
1989	98.8	99.8	98.6	99.2

Source: Department of Defense statistics

**Table C-5. PERCENTAGE OF ARMY MALE ENTRANTS IN
CATAGORIES I-III A BY RACE FOR SELECTED YEARS
(non-prior service)**

Year	White	Black	Other	Total
1977	50.5	20.0	25.3	40.4
1978	57.2	20.6	28.5	43.3
1980	45.7	14.3	23.6	35.7
1981	50.6	14.4	27.5	39.5
1985	68.3	29.8	46.4	56.2
1989	72.6	35.5	51.8	62.5

Source: Department of Defense statistics

Table C-6. PERCENTAGE OF ARMY FEMALE ENTRANTS IN
CATAGORIES I-III A BY RACE FOR SELECTED YEARS
(non-prior service)

Year	White	Black	Other	Total
1977	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
1978	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
1980	65.0	29.6	31.9	49.3
1981	56.7	18.5	24.7	41.3
1985	74.2	41.3	53.0	61.9
1989	76.1	45.5	53.8	62.8

Source: Department of Defense statistics

**Table D-1. PERCENTAGE OF BLACK OFFICERS IN THE MILITARY
BY GRADE AND SERVICE, 1989**

Grade	Army	Navy	Air Force	Marine Corps
O-7 & over (general)	6.4	1.2	1.2	0.0
O-6 (colonel)	4.8	.8	2.1	1.4
O-5 (lt. colonel)	4.8	1.8	2.2	2.3
O-4 (major)	8.8	3.3	5.6	4.4
O-3 (captain)	13.8	3.9	6.8	4.6
O-2 (1st lieut.)	12.4	4.6	5.5	6.2
O-1 (2nd lieut.)	11.7	4.8	5.5	5.9
Warrant	9.2	6.6	--	9.7
Total Officers	10.7	3.7	5.5	5.2

Note: Army titles in parentheses have equivalent ranks in other services.

Source: Department of Defense statistics

**Table D-2. PERCENTAGE OF BLACK ENLISTED IN THE MILITARY
BY GRADE AND SERVICE, 1989**

Grade	Army	Navy	Air Force	Marine Corps
E-9 (sgt. maj.)	31.6	5.7	13.5	17.5
E-8 (master sgt.)	24.2	5.4	14.7	19.6
E-7 (sgt. 1st cl.)	29.1	7.2	18.5	20.4
E-6 (staff sgt.)	36.9	12.0	18.3	25.4
E-5 (sgt.)	36.2	15.8	18.7	24.3
E-4 (cpl./spec.)	30.9	17.0	18.7	20.0
E-3 (pvt. 1st cl.)	27.5	23.2	14.2	19.2
E-2 (private)	27.2	21.4	12.6	19.5
E-1 (private)	25.9	23.7	12.3	19.3
Total Enlisted	31.2	16.9	17.3	20.7

Note: Army titles in parentheses have equivalent ranks in other services.

Source: Department of Defense statistics

**Table D-3. PERCENTAGE OF WOMEN OFFICERS IN THE MILITARY
BY GRADE AND SERVICE, 1989**

Grade	Army	Navy	Air Force	Marine Corps
O-7 plus (general)	.5	.8	.6	1.4
O-6 (colonel)	2.8	2.9	2.3	1.5
O-5 (lt. colonel)	5.9	6.7	4.7	1.6
O-4 (major)	10.1	11.7	10.2	2.7
O-3 (captain)	14.3	12.4	14.1	3.8
O-2 (1st lieut.)	17.2	11.1	20.9	3.4
O-1 (2nd lieut.)	17.4	11.5	19.2	4.6
Warrant	3.0	1.3	--	4.4
Total Officers	11.4	10.4	12.9	3.4

Note: Army titles in parentheses have equivalent ranks in other services.

Source: Department of Defense statistics

**Table D-4. PERCENTAGE OF WOMEN ENLISTED IN THE MILITARY
BY GRADE AND SERVICE, 1989**

Grade	Army	Navy	Air Force	Marine Corps
E-9 (sgt. maj.)	1.2	.7	.8	.9
E-8 (master sgt.)	2.2	2.1	2.5	1.5
E-7 (sgt. 1st cl.)	5.3	4.1	5.3	2.6
E-6 (staff sgt.)	8.9	6.8	9.7	4.8
E-5 (sgt.)	11.6	10.3	13.0	6.4
E-4 (cpl./spec.)	14.2	10.8	15.5	5.9
E-3 (pvt. 1st cl.)	11.2	13.0	18.1	4.7
E-2 (private)	12.8	11.1	19.1	5.5
E-1 (private)	11.1	10.6	20.0	4.8
Total Enlisted	11.2	9.6	13.0	5.1

Note: Army titles in parentheses have equivalent ranks in other services.

Source: Department of Defense statistics

**Table D-5. PERCENTAGE OF WOMEN OFFICERS IN THE ARMY
BY GRADE FOR SELECTED YEARS**

Grade	1978	1984	1989
O-7 & over	.5	.5	.5
O-6	2.2	2.0	2.8
O-5	2.0	3.1	5.9
O-4	3.1	7.3	10.1
O-3	8.4	12.2	14.3
O-2	13.7	15.7	17.2
O-1	11.7	18.2	17.4
Warrant	.5	1.6	3.0
Total Officers	6.4	9.5	11.4

Source: Department of Defense statistics

**Table D-6. PERCENTAGE OF WOMEN ENLISTED IN THE ARMY
BY GRADE FOR SELECTED YEARS**

Grade	1978	1984	1989
E-9	.6	.4	1.2
E-8	.6	1.0	2.2
E-7	.8	2.7	5.3
E-6	1.9	5.9	8.9
E-5	7.7	11.4	11.6
E-4	8.5	13.4	14.2
E-3	8.8	10.2	11.2
E-2	10.6	10.3	12.8
E-1	11.7	11.2	11.1
Total Enlisted	7.5	10.0	11.2

Source: Department of Defense statistics

Table D-7. PERCENTAGE OF BLACKS AMONG ARMY FEMALE OFFICERS BY GRADE FOR SELECTED YEARS

Grade	1978	1984	1989
O-6 & Over	11.0	8.2	8.2
O-5	8.5	7.4	7.5
O-4	5.9	8.7	12.2
O-3	7.4	17.9	22.3
O-2	7.9	25.3	19.6
O-1	12.0	18.6	20.5
Warrant	17.6	15.0	21.0
Total Officers	8.7	17.8	19.5

Source: Department of Defense statistics

**Table D-8. PERCENTAGE OF BLACKS AMONG ARMY FEMALE
ENLISTED BY GRADE FOR SELECTED YEARS**

Grade	1964	1980	1989
E-9	23.8	27.8	21.6
E-8	27.3	13.7	26.6
E-7	20.1	29.6	42.0
E-6	23.4	42.6	55.2
E-5	29.0	51.7	53.8
E-4	28.3	45.2	47.5
E-3	26.5	34.3	41.9
E-2	28.6	29.9	40.4
E-1	32.8	34.8	40.1
Total Enlisted	28.7	42.1	47.2

Source: Department of Defense statistics

**Table E-1. MARITAL STATUS: ARMY ENLISTED BY GRADE
AND SEX, 1989 (percentages)**

	E1-E3		E4-E5		E6-E9	
	M	F	M	F	M	F
Unmarried No Children	69.2	62.6	38.5	33.0	5.3	21.4
Unmarried w/ Children	4.5	6.7	4.1	11.1	11.6	15.4
Married Mil. Spouse	1.3	20.4	4.2	33.1	3.9	36.0
Married Civ. Spouse	25.0	10.3	53.2	22.8	79.2	27.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Department of Defense statistics

**Table E-2. MARITAL STATUS: NAVY ENLISTED BY GRADE
AND SEX, 1989 (percentages)**

	E1-E3		E4-E5		E6-E9	
	M	F	M	F	M	F
Unmarried No Children	74.8	58.5	47.0	41.7	10.5	30.5
Unmarried w/ Children	4.7	5.8	3.9	9.3	4.3	10.0
Married Mil. Spouse	1.0	20.7	2.9	30.8	2.7	33.6
Married Civ. Spouse	19.5	15.0	46.2	18.2	82.5	25.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Department of Defense statistics

**Table E-3. MARITAL STATUS: AIR FORCE ENLISTED BY GRADE
AND SEX, 1989 (percentages)**

	E1-E3		E4-E5		E6-E9	
	M	F	M	F	M	F
Unmarried No Children	60.2	60.2	27.0	24.9	4.8	15.4
Unmarried w/ Children	1.8	2.3	3.4	9.4	4.6	10.5
Married Mil. Spouse	2.7	25.9	7.7	46.2	4.5	57.7
Married Civ. Spouse	35.3	11.6	61.9	19.5	86.1	16.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Department of Defense statistics

**Table E-4. MARITAL STATUS: MARINE CORPS ENLISTED BY GRADE
AND SEX, 1989 (percentages)**

	E1-E3		E4-E5		E6-E9	
	M	F	M	F	M	F
Unmarried No Children	73.7	54.9	43.9	28.9	6.6	31.0
Unmarried w/ Children	1.8	2.6	3.2	10.3	4.9	9.0
Married Mil. Spouse	3.3	35.1	3.2	32.7	3.5	38.0
Married Civ. Spouse	21.2	7.4	49.7	28.1	85.0	22.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Department of Defense statistics

**Table E-5. MARITAL STATUS: ARMY OFFICERS BY GRADE
AND SEX, 1989 (percentages)**

	01-02		03-04		05 and over	
	M	F	M	F	M	F
Unmarried No Children	41.5	59.1	12.9	33.9	2.7	42.4
Unmarried w/ Children	1.5	4.5	2.0	6.4	2.7	10.2
Married Mil. Spouse	3.0	23.5	3.7	35.7	1.2	20.4
Married Civ. Spouse	54.0	12.9	81.4	24.0	93.4	27.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Department of Defense statistics

**Table E-6. MARITAL STATUS: NAVY OFFICERS BY GRADE
AND SEX, 1989 (percentages)**

	01-02		03-04		05 and over	
	M	F	M	F	M	F
Unmarried No Children	47.3	63.7	19.5	45.4	5.8	46.8
Unmarried w/ Children	1.4	3.3	1.5	3.3	3.9	7.6
Married Mil. Spouse	3.0	24.0	3.9	31.4	1.5	21.3
Married Civ. Spouse	48.3	9.0	75.1	19.9	88.8	24.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Department of Defense statistics

**Table E-7. MARITAL STATUS: AIR FORCE OFFICERS BY GRADE
AND SEX, 1989 (percentages)**

	01-02		03-04		05 and over	
	M	F	M	F	M	F
Unmarried No Children	39.0	58.3	10.3	38.3	15.4	46.3
Unmarried w/ Children	1.4	3.1	2.0	4.2	1.9	3.9
Married Mil. Spouse	3.4	25.2	4.5	33.0	3.7	33.7
Married Civ. Spouse	56.2	13.4	83.2	24.5	79.0	16.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Department of Defense statistics

**Table E-8. MARITAL STATUS: MARINE CORPS OFFICERS BY GRADE
AND SEX, 1989 (percentages)**

	01-02		03-04		05 and over	
	M	F	M	F	M	F
Unmarried No Children	46.3	59.1	13.9	43.1	1.9	34.3
Unmarried w/ Children	.8	2.6	2.3	3.9	2.6	8.6
Married Mil. Spouse	1.6	29.8	2.5	39.9	1.4	17.2
Married Civ. Spouse	51.3	8.5	81.3	13.1	94.1	39.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Department of Defense statistics

**Table E-9. FAMILY STATUS: ARMY ENLISTED BY GRADE
AND SEX, 1989 (percentages)**

	E1-E3		E4-E5		E6-E9	
	M	F	M	F	M	F
Unmarried No Children	69.2	62.6	38.5	33.0	5.3	21.4
Unmarried w/ Children	4.5	6.7	4.1	11.1	11.6	15.4
Married No Children	11.2	20.8	17.0	24.6	10.3	21.9
Married w/ Children	15.1	9.9	40.4	31.3	72.8	41.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Department of Defense statistics

**Table E-10. FAMILY STATUS: TOTAL DOD ENLISTED BY GRADE
AND SEX, 1989 (percentages)**

	E1-E3		E4-E5		E6-E9	
	M	F	M	F	M	F
Unmarried No Children	68.9	59.9	37.9	32.2	6.8	22.9
Unmarried w/ Children	3.5	4.4	3.8	10.1	4.4	12.5
Married No Children	13.5	25.2	17.6	25.2	10.1	22.7
Married w/ Children	14.1	10.5	40.7	32.5	78.7	41.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Department of Defense statistics

**Table E-11. FAMILY STATUS: TOTAL DOD OFFICERS BY GRADE
AND SEX, 1989 (percentages)**

	01-02		03-04		05 and over	
	M	F	M	F	M	F
Unmarried No Children	42.5	49.8	13.5	38.6	3.5	47.3
Unmarried w/ Children	1.3	3.5	1.9	4.8	2.7	7.7
Married No Children	27.3	26.2	17.6	28.6	9.9	16.4
Married w/ Children	28.9	10.5	67.0	28.0	83.9	28.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Department of Defense statistics

**Table F-1. COMPARISONS OF CIVILIAN AND ARMY LIFE BY
ARMY VETERANS (Percent stating selected values
more likely to occur in Army than civilian life.)**

Value	First-Term Separatees	Mid-Term Separatees	Retirees
Promotion Opportunity	42.1	43.4	50.2
Better Supervisors	14.2	17.9	31.1
Self-Development	25.8	27.5	47.8
Credit for Good Work	20.2	20.5	40.2
Enjoying Work	13.2	15.7	28.7
Making Friends	25.2	28.3	36.1

Source: Army Experience Survey, 1986

Table G-1. AVERAGE AFQT PERCENTILE OF ENLISTED MEMBERS BY GRADE AND SERVICE, 1987

Enlisted Grade	Army	Navy	Air Force	Marine Corps
E-9	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
E-8	n/a	72.9	77.7	n/a
E-7	61.8	77.8	76.0	61.6
E-6	47.6	65.2	70.2	56.2
E-5	47.5	61.6	60.8	55.6
E-4	52.4	60.1	59.1	59.1
E-3	58.3	55.0	63.6	54.6
E-2	58.2	56.0	62.0	58.3
E-1	57.2	51.5	61.8	54.9

Source: Department of Defense statistics